

Against the Grain

Volume 21 | Issue 6

Article 44

December 2009

Getting Our Feet Wet: One Library's Experience with Transactional Access

Ryan Weir

Murray State University, ryan.weir@murraystate.edu

Ashley Ireland

Murray State University, Ashley.ireland@murraystate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weir, Ryan and Ireland, Ashley (2009) "Getting Our Feet Wet: One Library's Experience with Transactional Access," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 21: Iss. 6, Article 44.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.2389>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

more liberal in their compromises may enjoy short-term savings, but their lack of perpetual access provisions may subject them to perils in the future. In contrast, libraries that are uncompromising in their commitment to securing perpetual access provisions can rest assured that their collections will continue to be accessible by future generations. However, they will be investing in the status quo at a time when everything about libraries is changing. 🌸

Endnotes

1. **Jim Stemper** and **Susan Barribeau**, "Perpetual Access to Electronic Journals: A Survey of One Academic Research Library's Licenses," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 50, no. 2 (2006): 104.
2. **Ross Atkinson**, "Six Key Challenges for the Future of Collection Development: Introduction for the Janus Breakout Sessions," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 50, no. 4 (2006): 245.
3. **Thomas H. Teper**, "Current and Emerging Challenges for the Future of Library and Archival Preservation," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 49, no. 1 (2005): 32-39.
4. **Beth R. Bernhardt** et al., "Pay-Per-View Options: Is Transactional Access Right for My Institution?" Panel presentation sponsored by the ALCTS CCS Electronic Resources Interest Group and given at the ALA annual conference, Chicago, July 11, 2009 (slides and audio available at <http://connect.ala.org/node/79063>); **Lindsey Schell**, **Katy Ginanni**, and **Benjamin Heet**, "Playing the Field: Pay-Per-View E-Journals and E-Books." Presentation given at the NASIG annual conference, Asheville, North Carolina, June 6, 2009; **Adam Murray** and **Ryan Weir**, "Giving the People What They Want: User-Driven Acquisition of Journal Articles." Presentation given at the Charleston Conference, Charleston, South Carolina, November 5, 2009.
5. **Paul Harwood** and **Albert Prior**, "Testing Usage-Based E-Journal Pricing," *Learned Publishing* 21, no. 2 (2008): 133-39.
6. **Patrick L. Carr**, "Acquiring Articles through Unmediated, User-Initiated Pay-Per-View Transactions: An Assessment of Current Practices," *Serials Review* 35, no. 4 (2009): 272-77.
7. See line 80 of **Eliot's** poem "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock."
8. See, for example, the pricing model of the **University of Chicago Press**: <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/userimages/ContentEditor/1252948133675/2010catalog.pdf>.
9. **Rick Anderson**, "It's Not about the Workflow: Patron-Centered Practices for 21st-Century Serialists," *The Serials Librarian* 51, no. 3/4 (2007): 190.

Getting Our Feet Wet: One Library's Experience with Transactional Access

by **Ryan Weir** (Assistant Professor, Serials and Electronic Resources Librarian, University Libraries Murray State University) <ryan.weir@murraystate.edu>

and **Ashley Ireland** (Assistant Professor, Reference Librarian, University Libraries Murray State University) <Ashley.Ireland@murraystate.edu>

Introduction/History:

Murray State University is a mid-sized regional institution located in rural western Kentucky. The university currently has an enrollment of approximately 11,000 and an FTE of 8383 for the fall semester. In 2005, following years of passive-reallocation of one-time purchase funds to serial holdings funds, **Murray State University Libraries** was forced to dramatically cut its journal holdings. For years prior, any journal requested by the faculty was purchased with no foresight into the budget growth needed to sustain the subscription. Thus, many of the titles cut in 2005 were used by few, but were relied upon by those who used them. Since 2005, journal prices have continued to increase, bringing **Murray State University Libraries** to the point of completely exhausting the holdings budget for the 2009-2010 fiscal year. While we are committed to not cutting journal access, we have come to the decision we must re-evaluate the current continuations budget and strategy for providing access to content. We also wanted to tap into the **iTunes**-model of selling items on the unit level rather than the entire entity. Part of this new strategy is the implementation of a transactional access program with **Science Direct (Elsevier)**.

Fall out of Cancellations

Though the 2005 cuts were entirely necessary, they were made with little to no consultation with the faculty who depended upon them. The administration of the Libraries did little to explain or justify such cuts, which were criticized harshly. These cuts occurred within the same fiscal year as a main floor renovation to the main library, which led some teaching faculty to believe that journals were cut to pay for new carpet and other aesthetic amenities. Such a dramatic cut with so little explanation left the libraries being viewed negatively and as having poor fiscal management skills. Due to the high cost of scientific materials specifically, items within those disciplines were hardest hit, and the relationship between the university libraries and the departments of the sciences were the most tumultuous.

In the few years since the 2005 journal titles cut, nearly all of the faculty within the university libraries has been replaced. Some of the journals that were cut were restored if required for accreditation, or held higher

priority over other titles which could be cut. Though the collaborative relationship between the libraries and those academic departments which were hardest hit by the journal cut has improved, there remains a lasting legacy that seems to cloud communication to this day. It is our mission to repair these past issues and to improve upon our relationships with the entire university community. It is also our mission to provide access to as much content as possible to support our students and faculty.

Research of Programs

Before deciding on which pay-per-view/transactional access program to implement, we set out to review the literature, send out emails to colleagues and listservs, and search publishers' sites to find available programs. These inquiries provided us with some information, and the response from listserv inquiries resulted in numerous other entities interested in our findings, as many libraries are in the same situation that we found ourselves.

Based on the information that we were able to acquire, we decided that **Science Direct Transactional Access** would be the best program for us at this point in time. We came to this

conclusion for a variety of reasons, including: the content coverage, ease of use, negotiation ability for price due to the fact we had no online content with **Science Direct** at the time, and it was a program with which one of the authors had familiarity, as he had helped to investigate and implement at a previous institution and so was somewhat aware of the process.

Negotiation of Contract and Pricing

We made initial contact with **Science Direct** to clarify the differences between their various programs. From there we worked with our representative to establish which program best met our needs and allowed us to purchase articles at the lowest possible cost. Our decision to opt in to the transactional access program and to move our **Elsevier** journal subscriptions to print-plus-online allowed us to receive a big reduction in the cost of each article purchased through the program. Our journal costs did go up, but because it was and is our plan to transition as much of our print content to online in the near future, this decision made sense both practically and fiscally. The negotiation process on pricing was very easy and was ac-

continued on page 18



completed through a handful of emails and phone conversations.

Negotiating the contract was also very easy. The contract we received from **Elsevier** contained most of the items that are musts and did not contain any of the items that we initially red flagged as necessary changes, with the exception of legal jurisdiction. **Elsevier** made all of the changes that we requested. **Elsevier** still requires (2) original copies of the contract — one they retain and one they mail back to the university after it is signed at their headquarters. Waiting on the contract to be returned took longer than the entire contact negotiation process.

Implementation

For this first implementation of the transactional access program we decided not to authenticate through IP ranges and open the program to the entire university community. We came to this decision due to the fact we had limited funding available and wanted to make sure the program would be well received before we moved on to a larger, more expensive, program. We also have more control over money used and who can use it in this model. With regard to re-opening access to some of the 2005 journal cuts, it was appealing to us to market this solely to faculty of relevant departments (specifically, the sciences) first.

We opted for a process that used username/password authentication. The process of setting up this login/password authentication model was difficult at first, but as we have progressed in the start-up process, we have become more familiar with the functions of assigning faculty to their user group and allocating funds to each of the user groups. The administrator can assign faculty to a group using the admin interface and the faculty's email address. The system automatically creates an email with authentication information and delivers it to the faculty member.

The second part of this implementation was bringing the faculty members on board. We have just started, but it has proved to be an interesting process.

Communicating with Faculty

Once it was determined that a Pay-Per-View model was a better business plan that would open up thousands more titles and allow for money to be spent at the point of need, university libraries' faculty began "feeling out" the idea first with the Dean of the College of Science, Engineering, and Technology. As a scientist, we knew that he would only approve of such a model if the logic was justifiable with supporting research. Once his approval was given, we decided to leave it up to him to distribute the pre-paid articles to his own faculty, and he recommended that there be no divvying at all — merely the monitoring of usage for this initial year. Thus, all Pay-Per-View purchases would come from the same large pool, and the program's continuance would be determined by how much each department had used.

against the grain people profile

Ryan Weir

Murray State University, University Libraries
Waterfield Library, Murray, KY 42071
Phone: (270) 809-5607 • Fax: (270) 809-5609
<ryan.weir@murraystate.edu>

BORN & LIVED: Born in Greencastle, IN. Lived in Southern and Central Indiana.

EDUCATION: Attended **Indiana State University** – B.S. Elementary Education and Special Education (K-12). Attended **IUPUI IU SLIS** Indianapolis – MLS.

PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES: Currently the Serials and Electronic Resources Librarian for **Murray State University Libraries**. Member of: **ALA, KLA, NASIG**.

IN MY SPARE TIME I LIKE: I have two daughters of my own **Emma** (2) and **Gracie** (3), and a soon to be adopted nephew **Jon** (2), so I have very little free time, but have a lot of fun with them.

FAVORITE BOOKS: I do most of my reading online or in an e-format.

PET PEEVES/WHAT MAKES ME MAD: Overcomplexity and lousy signage and bad spelling.

GOAL I HOPE TO ACHIEVE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW: Achieve tenure at **Murray State University** and continue to contribute to the profession.

HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS: I think it depends on where you are at; the needs of each individual library vary to such a large degree. I think in the next few years we will have to look at striking a balance between traditional subscriptions, open access models, pay-per-view options, and other sources of content. I think there will have to be give and take on both sides of the aisle, (publishers/vendors and libraries). 🌲



The program was revealed at a meeting of the Chairs of the departments within the College of Science, Engineering, and Technology just prior to the fall 2009 semester. Information prepared for this meeting included: a list of all the **Science Direct** journal titles included in the program, listed both by title and by discipline; a list of the titles available that had been cut in 2005; and a list of the titles available that are frequently (e.g., >5 requests per year) Inter-Library Loaned. The program was met with enthusiasm and thanks, as well as reluctance and suspicion. Some of the department chairs deemed this a progressive move, while others were suspect that this was a move to "get rid of" the journal subscriptions entirely, as well as Inter-Library Loan.

The program rolled out to the faculty via an email invitation from **Science Direct**. The mechanism was fairly quick, as departmental affiliations were created for statistical and monitoring purposes, and a simple email would affiliate the departmental name with the user's personal email. After logging into **Science Direct**, all users would simply have to identify that they are using the departmental access, and all articles are simply one click away.

The Future

In the short-term, we will be continuing to communicate with the targeted faculty groups

and get as many of them enrolled in the program as possible. Though we realize the first few weeks of school are hectic for everyone, we would have liked to see more faculty respond in a timely manner to the emails that provided them with their login information.

In the longer-term, we have initially committed to a three year program trial that is fully funded for each of the departments involved. We will be gathering statistics monthly on use by department, to inform the Dean of the College of Science, Engineering, and Technology to inform the allocation process for next fiscal year. We will also use these statistics to plan for future expansions or cancellations of our pay-per-view/transactional access programs. Alongside the transactional program, we intend to gather statistics on our current journal subscription usage. We will be looking for opportunities to switch individual titles to transactional access if the usage is consistent, but low. We will also be looking at adding subscriptions, if possible, to items that have consistently high usage within the transactional process. Ultimately, we are looking to ensure that the funds have the highest cost benefit, and that we are offering *the most* content that we can offer with the funds we are allocated.

Statistics can be gathered/received in two different ways. **Science Direct** sends out

continued on page 20

monthly use statements; this report shows the number of articles used by each of our departmental groups and the corresponding cost analysis. Statistics can also be gathered via the administrative interface. These statistics are real time and can be accessed at any time by the administrator. In addition, the administrator can set up email alerts to send out a notification email once a certain budgetary threshold is met within each of the accounts.

If the program proves to be successful, we will be looking into expanding the Pay-Per-View model with other, perhaps more specialized, publishers.

Conclusion

Transactional access/pay-per-view allows libraries to offer expanded access to content for which they cannot afford traditional subscriptions. **Murray State University Libraries** sees transactional access as one new tool in our arsenal. We do not intend for it to be a replacement for traditional modes of journal access, but rather a supplement to our existing collections. This program may also allow us to reallocate funds for rarely used journals that are available via transactional access/pay-per-view to purchase journals that will be used on a more frequent basis.

While we are in the beginning stages of this process we believe the experience has proved to be an exciting and relatively easy process thus far. We look forward to continuing our journey into the realm of transactional access/pay-per-view.

A Note to Publishers, Vendors and Librarians

After attending/presenting at the Electronic Resources Interest group meeting at the **2009 American Libraries Association Conference** in Chicago, IL, we have gained further valuable insight into the pay-per-view options that are available. We will be using this information to inform further program allocations.

After talking with librarians from all over the country, we also have a better grasp on the need and interest in such programs. In the future we can see the need for a vendor such as **EBSCO** or **SWETS** once again providing a pay-per-view/transactional access model across publisher lines, or, rather, an **iTunes** model for journals.

We would like to take this closing opportunity to challenge a vendor to roll out an inter-publisher pay-per-view service within the next few years and ask that fellow librarians contact their vendors to encourage them to move toward offering this type of service. We in the academic community want, but even more, *need* a service like this! If you build it we will come! 🌱

Pay-Per-Use Article Delivery at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

by **Mindy King** (Serials Librarian, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point Library, 900 Reserve St., Stevens Point, WI 54481; Phone: 715-346-2321) <mking@uwsp.edu>

and **Aaron Nichols** (Access Services Librarian, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point Library, 900 Reserve St., Stevens Point, WI 54481; Phone: 715-346-5273) <anichols@uwsp.edu>

Introduction

Do your users really care about which subscriptions your library holds? Of course not, they just want the information they need and they want it quickly. Sure, there are those old hold-outs who want to know that their favorite pricey journal is just a walk across campus to the library, purchased *just in case* it may one day be needed. But, for most college libraries low-use, high-priced journal subscriptions are no longer sustainable and don't make much sense to continue. Many of these high-priced journal titles don't even belong in most college libraries to begin with. An institution that grants doctorates in chemical engineering can justify subscribing to *The Journal of Polymer Science*. But what about an institution like **UW-Stevens Point** that doesn't grant doctorates and only offers four master's degrees (none of which are in the hard sciences)? Yet, we still kept that subscription running and the money flowing — that is until we adopted our pay-per-use program.

Pay-Per-Use

While many journal subscriptions are pricey, but worth keeping due to high use, there are an alarming number of journal titles that are rarely used and cost a fortune. This is where pay-per-use comes in handy. Pay-per-use is the practice of purchasing individual journal articles directly from the publisher instead of carrying subscriptions. The user becomes a stronger participant in collection development by telling us exactly what is needed. The requested content is delivered to the user *just in time*, rather than the library guessing what might be needed and paying for costly subscriptions *just in case* they are needed. Of course, pay-per-use is not the answer for every journal subscription. There are definite advantages and disadvantages to consider before moving forward. See Figure 1 (page 24).

Background

The **University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point** is an undergraduate college with only a handful of graduate-level programs. **UW-Stevens Point** is part of the greater **University of Wisconsin System** and is one of 13 comprehensive (primarily undergraduate) campuses in the **UW System**. The **Council of University of Wisconsin Libraries (CUWL)** provides a forum and structure for

library and information planning within the **University of Wisconsin System**.

In June 2007, **CUWL** began pursuing the idea of pay-per-use article delivery in response to complaints from a group of faculty members from across the various comprehensive campuses demanding access to “the same resources **Madison** has” — referring, in part, to the **Elsevier Science Direct** and **Wiley Inter-science** subscriptions held by **UW-Madison**. The comprehensive **UW** campuses could not afford the hefty subscription fees for these databases, either collectively or individually. The faculty group also commented that while interlibrary loan services are highly regarded, there are many times when article delivery is too slow through traditional interlibrary loan services; particularly when faculty are competing for time-sensitive patents or scholarly publications. These factors made pay-per-use the best, perhaps the only, option to satisfy those research demands.

A **CUWL** committee, in conjunction with a statewide cooperative library support organization (**WiLS**), was able to negotiate discounts with **Wiley** and **Elsevier** for articles purchased directly from those publishers. **CUWL** set aside a pot of money to help the comprehensive campuses fund this new concept of pay-per-use, although individual campus libraries were still responsible for funding a portion of the service. **WiLS** also developed a simplified workflow to aid in ease of article ordering. A special queue was set up in the interlibrary loan system (**ILLIAD**) so that any **Wiley** or **Elsevier** article requested via interlibrary loan would automatically be flagged, and library staff could then easily determine whether or not to provide the article via the pay-per-use method.

Reason for Implementing at UW-Stevens Point

For political reasons (or perhaps pure nostalgia) **UW-Stevens Point** continued to subscribe to a number of high-cost, low-use print-only titles that gathered gobs of dust on our shelves. While our serials budget remained stagnant, journal subscription costs continued to balloon. Unable (and unwilling) to keep these subscriptions (or switch to electronic) we had little choice but to cancel several titles. Journal cancellations are always bad PR for an academic library — even if we are canceling subscriptions nobody is reading. This situation gave us the idea: why not cancel a long list of high-cost, low-use print journals and offer fast article delivery (via pay-per-use) in place of the subscriptions?

continued on page 22

